

the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey, and the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School made to Shanghai last year. These exchange visits are designated to improve the knowledge and understanding of knowledgeable practitioners of our two countries. It is therefore a sincere pleasure to recognize this visit as an important step in what I believe is the right direction for the future. As globalization of the economy and the environment increase in importance these joint efforts to establish good relationships enabling important scientific research to be shared across borders will be of significant importance to us all in the future. We will all benefit from this initiative establishing this highly successful relationship at such an early stage.

I find this effort to correspond perfectly with the needs of tomorrow's world, and I applaud the cooperation of these sister hospitals in making this joint effort such a success. It is my firm belief that this joint effort by these honorable institutions will contribute not only to my constituents but to many other people across both our countries. I would therefore once again like to welcome these distinguished visitors to our country and ask my colleagues to join me in offering these two hospitals the best of luck for their future cooperation.

RECOGNITION OF THE GLENN L. MARTIN PLANT WORKERS

HON. ROBERT L. EHRLICH, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1995

Mr. EHRLICH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to publicly recognize an outstanding group of individuals who worked for victory in Middle River, MD, during World War II.

During the war, tens of thousands of hard-working men and women converged in Middle River to form one of the first planned communities in America. They toiled diligently at the Glenn L. Martin Plant, where their hard work helped give the United States victory in World War II. Many of these same individuals later helped America fight and win the cold war.

The Middle River plant was started by Glenn L. Martin, a brilliant designer and former stunt pilot. Martin brought his company to Middle River to design and build new warplanes when the United States entered World War II. During the 1930's the Martin plant was one of the foremost in the world, contributing the first modern bombing planes to the U.S. Navy and Army Air Corps. During the war, the Martin Plant workers built more than 7,000 bombers. Without the efforts of these workers, peace may have come at a much higher price—if it came at all.

After the war, many of these workers settled in Maryland and continued their efforts at the Martin Plant and its corporate successor, Martin Marietta. They built planes, missiles, and electronics for our Nation's defense in the cold war. Today, the company, now called Lockheed Martin, employs about 1,000 people in Middle River.

Mr. Speaker, on October 15, 1995, these hard-working men and women will be honored for their efforts during the Glenn L. Martin Victory Celebration. They will once again gather together at the historic hangars at the Martin

State Airport to commemorate their 50th anniversary victory in World War II. Americans should take time to remember the role that the Martin workers played in helping to defend their country.

Mr. Speaker, I could not be more proud of the Martin workers and their contributions to democracy and world peace. These diverse men and women came together from all across the Nation with little in common. But together they forged a community and worked side-by-side because of a common purpose. We owe a tremendous debt to this special group of Americans, who sacrificed their time and effort to ensure that this country and the world would have a peaceful future.

THE SCIENCE RESEARCH BILL IS A SHAM

HON. JOHN J. LaFALCE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1995

Mr. LaFALCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my deep disappointment with the passage today of H.R. 2405, the so-called Omnibus Civilian Science Research Authorization Act of 1995. This bill unfortunately reflects the new realities in Washington, and it shows how far astray the new majority will go in its efforts to feed the insatiable hunger of the far right.

In the name of science, the GOP juggernaut rejected an amendment that would have deleted a provision in the bill prohibiting the EPA from studying indoor air pollution. This amendment wouldn't have added one cent to the amounts authorized in the bill. But the majority apparently wants to micro-manage to the point that it, not scientists, will decide what scientific endeavors will be undertaken.

Another amendment would have removed a prohibition barring the weather service from carrying out studies of long-term climate and global change. The head in the sands majority opted for ignorance and voted to prohibit crucial future studies.

These are just two examples of the medieval thinking that pervades this legislation, Mr. Speaker. While other nations are increasing their research budgets, we are not only slashing funding for it, but actually prohibiting much of it. This is folly, Mr. Speaker, and I deeply regret this sad instance of narrow Neanderthal thinking on the part of the majority in the House of Representatives.

A CRITICAL FLAW IN H.R. 2405

HON. PATRICK J. KENNEDY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 12, 1995

Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island. Mr. Speaker I rise today in opposition to what I believe is a critical flaw in HR 2405, the Omnibus Civilian Science Research Authorization Bill.

Title IV of HR 2405 relates to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. In my view this entire section is abusive to our Nation's need for a comprehensive understanding of our oceans, air, and coastal environments. Title IV does not take into account the economic as well as environmental impli-

cations of such massive cuts. In many cases fall well below the funding levels that have already been appropriated for NOAA in 1996. During debate on this section I will be supporting several amendments that seek to restore the integrity of NOAA and many of the programs for which it is responsible. Specifically, I would like to address two issues that have, in my view, fallen prey to the worst of intentions: the Global and Climate Change and Sea Grant Programs.

This bill recommends that the NOAA Climate and Global Change Program be reduced to \$53 million which represents an \$18 million or 27% reduction in spending from the FY 1995 budget.

This cut-back is short sighted. It ignores the potential savings we could realize from being prepared for severe weather. Rarely do we find a clearer illustration of the old saying "an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure."

Weather prediction is by no means an exact science. NOAA, however, is working to remove much of the guess work by developing the ability to anticipate short term climate variations. Improving our climate prediction capabilities would enable communities to prepare changing weather conditions. This bill will cripple our ability to see the clouds on the horizon and prepare for the oncoming storm.

The NOAA Climate and Global Change Program is equally important for our long term economic well-being. NOAA has designed a research program to better understand long term changes in weather patterns that will have profound effects on our economy in the 21st century.

NOAA is studying the roles of atmospheric gases in global warming. In this area ignorance will be costly and dangerous. The value of reducing climate-related uncertainty in the implementation of policies stabilizing greenhouse gas emissions is estimated to be \$100 billion for the U.S. between now and 2020.

NOAA is also seeking to understand longer-term climate variations, like those that give rise to persistent drought or recurring flooding over several years. Improving these climate predictions for the long term will enable resource managers in climate sensitive areas such as agriculture, water management, and energy supply to alter strategies and reduce economic vulnerability. Preliminary economic studies estimate potential savings in the U.S. of as much as \$2.7 billion annually in the agriculture sector alone.

In my state of Rhode Island, improved understanding of climate and global change is critical to of our economy. Right now 10% of Rhode Island's Gross Domestic Product is marine related. Much of this business, like commercial fishing, marina and boating activities, oceanographic research, and tourism, is directly effected by atmospheric and oceanographic conditions.

Clearly, as we look to reduce unnecessary federal spending, we should not deny ourselves the opportunity to reduce costs in the long run by taking preventative measures. A perfect example of this in New England was the winter of 1992-93. During that year many municipalities were caught unprepared for an unusually harsh winter and had inadequate supplies of salt or sand for roads, and insufficient fuel and provisions for acquiring additional electricity. The total cost of just one storm in March of that year was over \$1.6 billion for New England because we were unprepared.